



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

W

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,105	09/20/2000	Yoshio Tozawa	32405W053	8691

7590

07/03/2002

Smith Gambrell & Russell LLP
Beveridge DeGrandi Weilacher & Young
Intellectual Property Group
1850 M Street NW Ste 800
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2851

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,105

Applicant(s)

TOZAWA, YOSHIO

Examiner

Rochelle Blackman

Art Unit

2851

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. The term "intervenient" in claim 2 renders the claim indefinite because it cannot be determined where the "taper plate" is located in relation to the "mounting seat member" and the "mounting position on the vehicle body"; and the term "fixing" in the phrase, "...when fixing said chassis onto the mounting position of the vehicle body" in claim 2 renders the claim indefinite because it cannot be determined whether or not the "chassis" can be alternatively removed from the "mounting position of the vehicle body".
2. Claim 7 is indefinite because it recites "portions of said chassis other than said mounting seat member are disposed apart from said vehicle body...", which includes "falling prevention members..." which is recited in claim 4.
3. Claim 9 is indefinite because it recites "said seat member supports all weight of said chassis and said pair of cameras after said chassis is fixed to said vehicle body" while claim 4 already states the "falling prevention members" engages "both ends of said chassis with the vehicle" which implies that the "falling prevention members" also supports the "weight of said chassis and said pair of cameras after said chassis is fixed

Art Unit: 2851

to said vehicle body". The seat member along with the falling prevention members supports the weight of the chassis and the pair of cameras.

4. The phrase, "hooked sectional shape" in claim 10 renders the claim indefinite because it cannot be determined what a "hooked sectional shape" is.

5. Claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 fall with their parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 6,083,353 in view of Tsuchiya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,530,420.

Alexander, Jr. discloses "a structure for mounting cameras on a vehicle"(see FIG. 16); "a pair of stereo cameras..."(see 22 of FIG. 16); "a chassis..."(see 42 of FIG. 16) mounted on a vehicle (see col. 10, lines 47-49); and "a mounting seat member...fixed onto a front rail..." and "supports all weight of said chassis..."(see 44 of FIG. 16).

Alexander does not disclose a chassis mounted "in" a vehicle.

Tsuchiya teaches that it is known to mount "a pair of CCD cameras"(see 11a, 11b, 12a, and 12b of FIG. 4) of a "stereoscopic optical system"(see 10 of FIG. 4) inside, "at a front portion on the ceiling...", of a car (see col. 6, lines 25-27). Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2851

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the "pair of stereo cameras" of the Alexander, Jr. reference inside, at a front portion on the ceiling, of a car as taught by Tsuchiya.

2. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 6,083,353 in view of Tsuchiya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,530,420.

Alexander, Jr. disclosed the claimed invention except for a chassis "formed by one material having a high-coefficient of thermal conductivity" and/or formed from "an aluminum alloy".

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the "chassis" of the Alexander, Jr. reference of a lightweight material having a high-coefficient of thermal conductivity such as an aluminum alloy for easy mounting onto the roof or ceiling of a car, good stability, and good conduction of heat because of the constant exposure to heat due to its location. Furthermore, it has been held to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 is allowed.

Art Unit: 2851

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rochelle Blackman whose telephone number is (703) 308-2879. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russell Adams can be reached on (703) 308-2847. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



DAVID M. GRAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RB
June 26, 2002